

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	Fl	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,432	1	12/11/2000	George I. Davida	<u> </u>	3562
	7590	05/14/2004		EXAMINER	
George I. I			KIBLER, VIRGINIA M		
2424 E. Webster PI #201 Milwaukee, WI 53211				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•				2623	f
				DATE MAILED: 05/14/2004	· 5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/734,432	DAVIDA ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Virginia M Kibler	2623					
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a relative to reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a re ply within the statutory minimum of thirty d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT te, cause the application to become ABA	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 i	February 2004.						
<u> </u>	is action is non-final.						
,	·						
Disposition of Claims							
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>10, 13, 18</u> is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination is objected.	ccepted or b) objected to be e drawing(s) be held in abeyand ction is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)					
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date)/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 					

Art Unit: 2623

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment received on 2/27/04 has been entered. Claims 1-20 remain pending.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 10, 13, and 18 are objected to because of the following informalities: the amended portion in claim 10, line7 is unclear. It appears that "transmission means of" should be deleted. Claim 13 is in improper form because it depends on claim 13. Regarding claim 18, "pre-determined" should be changed to "predetermined" in line 3. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claim 13 recites the limitation "the error correcting code" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Application/Control Number: 09/734,432 Page 3

Art Unit: 2623

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. Claims 1-4, 12-15, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Davida et al. ("On Enabling Secure Applications Through Off-line Biometric").

Regarding claim 1, Davida et al. ("Davida") discloses a body part input means for generating an information signal impressed with characteristics of a body part (Sect. 6 and 6.1), an index generation means for dynamically generating one or more indices from the information signal, wherein the one or more indices are created by processing the information signal (Sect. 5.1, para 3), and a linking means to link at least one of the indices to an identity for the body part (Sect. 5.1; Sect. 2.2).

Regarding claim 2, Davida discloses an index as a function of a subset of data of the information signal (Sect. 5.1).

Regarding claim 3, Davida discloses generating indices from different partial information from the information signal or transformation of the information signal (Sect. 5.1).

Regarding claim 4, Davida discloses the information signal impressed with characteristics of a body part including a human eye (Sect. 6.1).

Regarding claim 12, Davida discloses applying error correcting codes to reduce errors in the information signal before dynamically generating one or more indices from the information signal (Sect. 3.2).

Art Unit: 2623

Regarding claim 13, Davida discloses the error correcting codes include computing roots of a polynomial over a Galois Field (Sect. 3.2, Algebraic decoding).

Regarding claim 14, Davida discloses dynamically generating one or more indices from the information signal by generating the one or more indices as hash values using a predetermined hashing function on the information signal (Sect. 5.1).

Regarding claim 15, Davida discloses the indices generated from the information signal cannot be used to reveal information about the characteristics of the body part included in the information signal (Sect. 5.1, page 155).

Regarding claim 16, Davida discloses generating an information signal impressed with characteristics of a body part (Sect. 6 and 6.1), processing the information signal to remove errors thereby creating a processed information signal (Sect. 3.2; Sect. 5.1), dynamically generating one or more indices from the processed information signal (Sect. 5.1), wherein one or more indices generated from the information signal cannot be used to reveal information about the body part included in the processed information signal (Sect. 5.1, page 155), obtaining a biometric template using one or more generated indices, wherein the biometric template includes an identity for the body part, and verifying the identity for the body part in the biometric template using the one or more generated indices (Sect. 5.1).

Regarding claims 17-20, the arguments analogous to those presented above for claims 13-15 and 4 are applicable to claims 17-20, respectively.

Application/Control Number: 09/734,432 Page 5

Art Unit: 2623

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 5, 6, and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davida et al. ("On Enabling Secure Applications Through Off-line Biometric").

Regarding claim 5, Davida discloses a body part input means for generating an information signal impressed with characteristics of a body part (Sect. 6 and 6.1), an index generation means for dynamically generating one or more indices from the information signal (Sect. 5.1), an information hiding means for hiding at least one index to obtain transformed biometric templates (Sect. 3.1; Sect. 5.1), and a verification means for verifying transformed biometric template with template linked by associated index (Sect. 5.1). Davida does not expressly disclose a transmission means for transmitting at least one transformed biometric template and index pair. However, Davida discloses that the off-line system is also applicable to on-line systems where information is stored in an on-line database instead of on storage cards (Sect. 2.2, NOTE), and would thereby entail a transmission means. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the system disclosed by Davida to expressly include a transmission means because it is a well-known methodology routinely utilized in the art and enables the reduction of security requirements imposed on the database, where privacy restrictions on the information exit (Sect. 2.2, NOTE).

Art Unit: 2623

Regarding claim 6, Davida discloses the information signal is generated from multiple readings of the body part (Sect. 5.1; Sect. 6.1).

Regarding claim 8, Davida discloses including a hamming weight test (Page 149, col. 2; Sect. 6.1).

Regarding claim 9, Davida discloses validation for authorization (Sect. 1; Sect. 5.1).

Regarding claim 10, the arguments analogous to those presented above for claim 5 are applicable to claim 10. Note, the on-line system entails transmission means to accept points.

Regarding claim 11, Davida discloses the biometric template including at least one index composed with the information signal (Sect. 5.1).

9. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davida et al. (On Enabling Secure Applications Through Off-line Biometric Identification) as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Canetti (Towards Realizing Random Oracles: Hash Functions that Hide all Partial Information).

Regarding claim 7, Davida discloses using a hash function as an information hiding means (Sect. 3.1). Davida does not appear to recognize using exclusive-or for signal transformation. However, Canetti teaches that it is known to use a hash function including exclusive-or for signal transformation (Page 465, para. 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the hash function disclosed by Davida to include using exclusive-or, as taught by Canetti, because it allows hiding all partial information of the signal (Abstract, lines 16-18) to protect a user's biometric template.

Art Unit: 2623

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Virginia M Kibler whose telephone number is (703) 306-4072. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 8:00 - 5:30 and every other Friday.

Art Unit: 2623

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au can be reached on (703) 308-6604. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Virginia Kibler

05/12/04

MEHRDAD DASTOURI PRIMARY EXAMINER

Mehrdad Daston

Page 8